Misc

2300 Lake Elmo Drive Billings, MT 59105 February 12, 2002

TO: Environmental Quality Council

Director's Office, Dept. of Environmental Quality

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks

Director's Office Parks Division

Fisheries Division

Wildlife Division

Lands Section

Design & Construction

Legal Unit

Regional Supervisors

Montana Historical Society, State Preservation Office

Janet Ellis, Montana Audubon Council

Montana Wildlife Federation

Montana State Library

George Ochenski

Montana Environmental Information Center

Wayne Hirst, Montana State Parks Foundation

Bob Harrington, DNRC Area Manager, Southern Land Office

County Commissioners

Allie Wood, USDA Forest Service

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The enclosed draft Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared for the USDA's Lewis Creek foot bridge and horse ford, and is submitted for your consideration.

Questions and comments will be accepted until March 13, 2002.

If you have questions or need additional copies of the draft EA, please contact Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks at 247-2940. Please send any written comments to the following address:

Lewis Creek Bridge and Ford EA C/O Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks 2300 Lake Elmo Drive Billings MT 59105 or (jdarling@state.mt.us)

Thank you for your interest,

Harvey E. Nyberg Regional Supervisor

Enclosure

Carbon

DEPARTMENT OF FISH, WILDLIFE AND PARKS

1420 E 6th Ave, PO Box 200701 Helena, MT 59620-0701 (406) 444-2535

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

| Project TitleLewis Creek Foot Bridge and Horse Ford |
|--|
| Division/Bureau _Fisheries/Management |
| Program Fisheries |
| Description of Project _The proposed action calls for the removal of the unsafe Lewis Creek foot |
| bridge, and construction of a new foot bridge and horse ford in a narrower section of the creek at |
| T7S R18F S15 NW1/4 SF1/4 |

POTENTIAL IMPACT ON PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

| | MAJOR | MODERATE | MINOR | NONE | UNKNOWN | COMMENTS ON ATTACHED PAGES |
|--|-------|----------|-------|------|---------|-------------------------------------|
| Terrestrial & aquatic life and habitats | | | | X | | |
| 2. Water quality, quantity & distribution | | | | X | | |
| 3. Geology & soil quality, stability & moisture | | | | X | | |
| 4. Vegetation cover, quantity & quality | | | X | | | I-4 |
| 5. Aesthetics | | | | X | | |
| 6. Air quality | | | | X | | |
| 7. Unique, endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources | | | | X | | |
| 8. Demands on environmental resources of land, water, air & energy | | | | X | | |

| | MAJOR | MODERATE | MINOR | NONE | UNKNOWN | COMMENTS ON ATTACHED PAGES |
|--------------------------------------|-------|----------|-------|------|---------|-------------------------------------|
| 9. Historical & archaeological sites | | | | | X | |

POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

| | MAJOR | MODERATE | MINOR | NONE | UNKNOWN | COMMENTS ON ATTACHED PAGES |
|--|-------|----------|-------|------|---------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Social structures & mores | | | | X | | |
| 2. Cultural uniqueness & diversity | ě | | | X | | |
| 3. Local & state tax base & tax revenue | | | | X | | |
| 4. Agricultural or industrial production | | | | X | , | |
| 5. Human health | | | | X | | |
| 6. Quantity & distribution of community & personal income | | | | X | | |
| 7. Access to & quality of recreational and wilderness activities | | | X | | | II-7 |
| 8. Quantity & distribution of employment | | | | X | | |
| 9. Distribution & density of population & housing | | | | X | | |
| 10. Demands for government services | | | | X | | - |
| 11. Industrial & commercial activity | | | | X | | |
| 12. Demands for energy | | | | X | | |

| | MAJOR | MODERATE | MINOR | NONE | UNKNOWN | COMMENTS ON ATTACHED PAGES |
|---|-------|----------|-------|------|---------|-------------------------------------|
| 13. Locally adopted environmental plans & goals | | | | X | | |
| 14. Transportation networks & traffic flows | | | v | X | | |

Other groups or agencies contacted or which may have overlapping jurisdiction: <u>US Army Corps of Engineers</u>.

Individuals or groups contributing to this EA: None

| Recommendation | concerning pre- | paration of EIS | Not necessary: | no significant is | mpacts. |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------|
| 1 CCCCIIIIII I CII GGGGCICII | oonoon min | paramon or zio- | | | |

| EA | prepared | by: | J. | Darling |
|----|----------|-----|----|---------|
|----|----------|-----|----|---------|

| Date: | 2/12/02 | |
|-------|---------|--|
| Date. | 2/12/12 | |

COMMENTS

- I-4: The construction of the approaches to the horse ford will disturb minimal vegetation, mostly on the northern side. The foot bridge construction will affect only a small area for the sill placements. Five to six small trees will be removed.
- II-7: Construction of the foot bridge and horse ford will improve recreational access across Lewis Creek and to areas of the Custer Forest beyond.

APPENDIX A PRIVATE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT ACT CHECKLIST

The 54th Legislature enacted the Private Property Assessment Act, Chapter 462, Laws of Montana (1995). The intent of the legislation is to establish an orderly and consistent process by which state agencies evaluate their proposed actions under the "Takings Clauses" of the United States and Montana Constitutions. The Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution provides: "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." Similarly, Article II, Section 29 of the Montana Constitution provides: "Private property shall not be taken or damaged for public use without just compensation..."

The Private Property Assessment Act applies to proposed agency actions pertaining to land or water management or to some other environmental matter that, if adopted and enforced without

compensation, would constitute a deprivation of private property in violation of the United States or Montana Constitutions.

The Montana State Attorney General's Office has developed guidelines for use by state agency to assess the impact of a proposed agency action on private property. The assessment process includes a careful review of all issues identified in the Attorney General's guidance document (Montana Department of Justice 1997). If the use of the guidelines and checklist indicates that a proposed agency action has taking or damaging implications, the agency must prepare an impact assessment in accordance with Section 5 of the Private Property Assessment Act. For the purposes of this EA, the questions on the following checklist refer to the following required stipulation(s):

(List any mitigation/stipulations required, or note "None".)

DOES THE PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION HAVE TAKINGS IMPLICATIONS UNDER THE PRIVATE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT ACT?

| YES | NO | |
|-----|----|---|
| | X | 1. Does the action pertain to land or water management or environmental regulation affecting private real property or water rights? |
| | X | 2. Does the action result in either a permanent or indefinite physical occupation of private property? |
| | X | 3. Does the action deprive the owner of all economically viable uses of the property? |
| | X | 4. Does the action deny a fundamental attribute of ownership? |
| | X | 5. Does the action require a property owner to dedicate a portion of property or to grant an easement? [If the answer is NO , skip questions 5a and 5b and continue with question 6.] |
| | | 5a. Is there a reasonable, specific connection between the government requirement and legitimate state interests? |
| | | 5b. Is the government requirement roughly proportional to the impact of the proposed use of the property? |
| | X | 6. Does the action have a severe impact on the value of the property? |
| | X | 7. Does the action damage the property by causing some physical disturbance with respect to the property in excess of that sustained by the public generally? [If the answer is NO , do not answer questions 7a-7c.] |

| | 7a. Is the impact of government action direct, peculiar, and significant? |
|------|--|
| | 7b. Has government action resulted in the property becoming practically inaccessible, waterlogged, or flooded? |
| | 7c. Has government action diminished property values by more than 30% and necessitated the physical taking of adjacent property or property across a public way from the property in question? |

Taking or damaging implications exist if **YES** is checked in response to question 1 and also to any one or more of the following questions: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7a, 7b, 7c; or if **NO** is checked in response to questions 5a or 5b.

If taking or damaging implications exist, the agency must comply with Section 5 of the Private Property Assessment Act, to include the preparation of a taking or damaging impact assessment. Normally, the preparation of an impact assessment will require consultation with agency legal staff.

| Applicat | cion |
|----------|----------|
| Revised | 01/01/00 |

| AGENCY USE ONLY | Application # _ | | Date Received | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|--|
| Date Accepted | | Date Forwarded | | |

JOINT APPLICATION FOR PROPOSED WORK IN MONTANA'S STREAMS, WETLANDS, FLOODPLAINS AND OTHER WATER BODIES

To reduce paperwork, the agencies listed below have created this joint application form. This is **NOT** a joint permit. In the box below, **check all permits** that apply to your proposed work. After you complete the form, make a copy for each permit checked and sign each copy. **Send one copy with original signatures** to each agency responsible for each permit you have checked. Refer to the "*Information for Applicant*" sheet on the back of this form or the "*Guide to Stream Permitting in Montana*," available from participating agencies, for more information.

| agencies, for more information. | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| <u>PERMIT</u> | <u>AGENCY</u> | FEE | | | | | |
| ☐ Natural Streambed & Land | Local conservation district | No Fee | | | | | |
| Preservation Act (310) | MT Department of Fish, | No Fee | | | | | |
| ☐ Stream Protection Act (SPA124) (for government | Wildlife & Parks (DFWP) | Varies (\$25- | | | | | |
| agencies or government | County Floodplain | \$400) | | | | | |
| contractors only) | Administrator | Varies (\$0- | | | | | |
| □ Floodplain Permit | U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | \$100) | | | | | |
| | (COE) | No Fee | | | | | |
| Section 404/Section 10 | MT Department of | License \$25 | | | | | |
| Permits | Environmental Quality (DEQ) | Easement \$50 | | | | | |
| □ 3A Authorization | MT Department of Natural | | | | | | |
| □ Navigable Rivers Land Use | Resources & Conservation | | | | | | |
| License/Easement | (DNRC) | | | | | | |

NOTE: Other laws may apply. It is your responsibility to obtain all necessary permits before beginning work. Incomplete applications will be rejected. 1. NAME OF LANDOWNER _USDA Forest Service Address Beartooth Ranger District HC 49 Box 3420 Day **Phone** (406) 446-2103 City/State/Zip Red Lodge Montana 59068 Evening Phone _____ 2. NAME OF **APPLICANT** (if different from landowner) Landowner Other (explain) Applicant is: (check one) Contractor ☑ Government Agency Landowner's Agent (Title) Address Day Phone City/State/Zip Evening Phone _____ Has the landowner consented to this project? Yes No 3. ATTACH A MAP with directions to locate the site where the work will be done. X Yes, attached. 4. NAME OF STREAM OR WATER BODY at site location <u>Lewis Creek</u>. Nearest town <u>Nye</u>

Contract letting date

Location \(\frac{1}{4} \) NW \(\frac{1}{4} \) SE \(\frac{1}{4} \), Section \(\frac{15}{15} \), Township \(\frac{7S}{15} \), Range \(\frac{18E}{18E} \), County \(\frac{Carbon}{18E} \)

This space is for SPA 124 permits only (government projects).

Project Name_

Control Number

| j. | TYPE OF PROJECT (check all that apply) Stream Crossing (bridges, culverts, fords) Bridge/Culvert Removal Road Construction/Maintenance Bank Stabilization Flood Protection Channel Alteration Irrigation Structure | Fish Habitat/Pond Recreation (docks, marinas, etc.) New Residential Structure Manufactured Home Commercial Structure Improvement to Existing Structure Utilities | Mining Dredging Core Drill Placement of Fill Water Well Wetland Alteration Other | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| ó. | WHAT IS THE PURPOSE of the proposed projective proposed action calls for the removal of the usuand the construction of foot bridge above the hore bridge abutment will not be removed. The approach approach minimal grading needs to be completed creek itself no construction will be completed. A area for stock crossing. No rocks will be removed | insafe Lewis Creek bridge, the construction of the creek archments to the creek will be at a 2-5% and on the south approach no grading natural dam barrier already exists crea | t. The Lewis Creek grade. The north will occur. In Lewis | | | |
| 7. | IS APPLICATION for an annual maintenance If yes, an annual plan of operation must be atta | _ | _X No | | | |
| 3. | PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION DATE: Start Is any portion of the work already completed ? work. | - | _/_01_/_2002 ribe the completed | | | |
|). | IN SECTIONS 9(a) through 9(e), DESCRIBE IN DETAIL the work you plan to do. Attach additional sheets if necessary. | | | | | |
| | Attach a plan or drawing of the proposed project. Include (1) ti sites; (3) location of storage or stockpile materials; (3) location (4) drainage facilities. Floodplain permit applicants are encour- | of existing or proposed structures, such as buildings | , utilities, roads, or bridges; | | | |
| | a. Dimensions of the project. Describe the impacted area. How many linear feet of bank will be impacted? How far will the proposed project extend into and away from the water body? | | | | | |
| | Below the current bridge a natural crossing al of grading down from the original trail to the work would need to be completed. A game tr built above the current bridge. The bridge wil disturbance. The sill width will be five feet w | creek crossing. Across the creek on the ail leads down to the creek. The new full be placed on simple sills allowing for | e south side no tread oot bridge would be | | | |
| | b. How much vegetation and what type of vege will the disturbed area be reclaimed? | tation will be removed or covered with | fill material? How | | | |

The removal of the Lewis Creek bridge will not disturb any vegetation. The construction of the approaches to the horse ford will disturb minimal vegetation, mostly on the northern side. The foot

bridge construction will affect only a small area for the sill placements. Five to six small trees will need to be removed

c. What **materials** will be used, and how much (cubic yards, linear feet, etc., of each)?

The less than one cubic yard will be used to retread the North and South approaches.

d. What **equipment** will be used for the work?

Hand crews.

- e. What steps will be taken during and after construction to minimize: (use additional sheets if necessary)
 - 1. Erosion and sedimentation?

The abutment will remain after the bridge is dismantle to prevent the unsupported bank from moving into the creek

2. Stream channel alterations?

No stream alterations will occur. The footbridge sills will be place above the high water mark. No construction in the creek will occur.

3. Effects on stream flow or water quality caused by materials used or removal of ground cover?

No effects on the stream flow or water quality will occur.

4. Effects on fish and aquatic habitat?

No long-term effects would occur on fish and aquatic habitat

5. Risks of flooding or erosion problems upstream and downstream?

No risk of flooding above or below the project.

- 10. COMPLETE 10(a) through 10(c) **ONLY** if you are applying for a **FLOODPLAIN OR SECTION 404/SECTION 10 PERMIT**.
 - a. Will the project involve placement of **fill material** in a wetland? If yes, describe. How much **wetland** area will be filled? Include a delineation of the wetland boundary and a calculation of the impacted acreage.
 - b. List names and addresses of **landowners** adjacent to and across from the project site. (At its discretion, the permitting agency may contact these landowners.)

| c. If you have already applied for any permits, list them and indicate whether they were issued, denied , or | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| are pending . | | | | | | | |
| | ****************************** | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| •• | Application Submittal Information (Send only to those agencies checked on page one of this form.) | | | | | | |
| 310 Permits . Submit three copies of the application unless specifically requested by the conservation of SPA 124 Permits (government projects only the application. (Note: For projects sponsored by to the Helena DFWP office.) Application review Floodplain Permits . Prior to submitting this application applicant may be required to hire a pro 60 days . | district. Application A set of prelique the Departmen The may take up plication, contaction, contaction. | ation review usually takes 30 to 60 iminary plans or sketches of the propose at of Transportation, two sets of plans m to 60 days. It the local floodplain administrator. Perr | days. d project must accompany ust be sent with this form mit requirements and fees | | | | |
| Section 404/Section 10 Permits. Nothing ad | ditional is requir | red unless specifically requested. Applic | ation review may take | | | | |
| 30 to 120 days. 3A Authorizations. Do not send this form direct notified if you must apply. If this authorization Easements on State Navigable Water Bodies the local DNRC land office for information. Land to 90 days. | n is needed, ap s. Additional fe | pplication review usually takes 10 des, a land survey, and other information | ays. will be required. Contact | | | | |
| SIGNATURES/AUTHORIZATIONS I certify that the above statements are true the work described herein or am acting as of the project site by inspection authorities comply with the stipulations of all permits | the duly auth s. Both the la | norized agent of the landowner. I | authorize the inspection | | | | |
| For 310 applicants only | | | | | | | |
| When an applicant or other team member disagrees with the conservation district supervisors' decision, the applicant or other team member shall request that an arbitration panel be appointed as provided in MCA 75-7-113 to hear the dispute and make a decision. The request must be made in writing and must be received by the district within five working days of the receipt of the supervisors' decision. Disputes may also be solved informally. The rules of arbitration are included with this form. | | | | | | | |
| By signing this form, I acknowledge that I have read and understand the Natural Streambed and Land Preservation Act rules of arbitration and agree, in any disputes arising from the supervisors' decision, to abide by the rules of arbitration. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Signature of Landowner | Date | Signature of Applicant | Date | | | | |
| (may be waived by agency for utilities and | l other easem | ent holders) | | | | | |